AF
JFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT:	Frank Bähren	**GROUP:**	2152
SERIAL NO:	09/892,783	**EXAMINER:**	Dohm Chankong
FILED:	June 27, 2001		
FOR:	GENERATING AN ADDRESS FOR UNITS OF A SECOND NETWORK CONNECTED TO A FIRST NETWORK		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COPY

Sir:

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

This amendment after final is in response to the Official Action, made final, dated August 12, 2005. Please amend the application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS:

Amend claims 7, 14 and 22 as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via facsimile on **August 18, 2005** to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450 at facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Sarah L. Henry

Sarah L. Henry

1. (Cancelled)

2. (Cancelled)

3. (Cancelled)

4. (Cancelled)

5. (Cancelled)

6. (Cancelled)

7. (Currently Amended) In a first network which can be linked to a second network, the first network including a plurality of network devices linked with one another and having an associated first address for unique identification in the first network, a method for generating a second address for each said device comprising:

manipulating the first address of each device by mathematically ~~adding~~ a predetermined number ~~thereto~~ and the first address to derive the second address which is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number, the second address ~~which~~ uniquely identifying~~ies~~ each such device in the second network, the second address being different than the first address.

8. (Cancelled)

9. (Cancelled)

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, where the first network comprises a private network and the second network comprises a public network.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, where the first network comprises a Media Oriented System Transport (MOST) network.

12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, where the second network comprises the Internet.

13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, where the first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and the second network.

14. (Currently Amended) In a first network that can be linked to a second network, the first network comprising communicably coupled network devices each having an associated first address that uniquely identifies each device in the first network,

where each device of the first network also has an associated second address that uniquely identifies each such device in the second network to which the first network is linked, where each second address is derived by mathematically summing ~~adding~~ a predetermined number to the corresponding first address of each device such that each second address is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number and that each second address is different than the corresponding first address.

15. (Cancelled)

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 14, where the first network comprises a private network and the second network comprises a public network.

19. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 14, where the first network comprises a Media Oriented System Transport (MOST) network.

20. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 14, where the second network comprises the Internet.

21. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 14, where the first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and the second network.

22. (Currently Amended) A multimedia system for implementation in a vehicle comprising:

a plurality of multimedia devices communicably coupled through a communication link to form a private Media Oriented System Transport (MOST) network, where each of the ~~said~~ plurality of multimedia devices has associated therewith a first address that uniquely identifies

each of the ~~said~~ multimedia devices in the MOST network, and where each of the ~~said~~ plurality of multimedia devices has associated therewith a second address that uniquely identifies each of the ~~said~~ multimedia devices in a public network, where the second address is derived by mathematically summing ~~adding~~ a predetermined number to the corresponding first address such that each second address is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number and that each second address is different than the corresponding first address.

23. (Previously Presented) The multimedia system of claim 22, further comprising:

a firewall residing on the Media Oriented System Transport MOST network for linking the MOST network to the public network.

24. (Cancelled)

25. (Previously Presented) The multimedia system of claim 22, where the public network comprises the Internet.

REMARKS

Claims 7, 14 and 22 have been amended herein. Claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting a telephone interview on August 17, 2005 to discuss this matter. Attorney Kosakowski (Reg. No. 33,394) and Examiner Chankong discussed the prior art and amending the claims to place the rejected claims in condition for allowance. No agreement was reached.

The Official Action is taken up in order as follows:

1-3. The Examiner's remarks directed toward the Applicant's arguments in the Amendment filed June 20, 2005 have been carefully considered and are deemed to be moot in view of the amendments made herein to claims 7, 14 and 22 - the three independent claims - as discussed hereinafter.

4. Claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, these claims are rejected due to the alleged multiple meanings of the term "adding", together with the two different alleged interpretations of the claimed feature "adding a predetermined number."

In response, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is moot in view of the amendments made herein to claims 7, 14 and 22, where such amendments clarify and better claim the feature of mathematically summing a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address. In particular, it is submitted that these amendments remove any alleged multiple meanings of the term "adding" and any alleged multiple different interpretations

of the claim language resulting therefrom. Reconsideration and removal of this rejection is hereby respectfully requested.

5-11. Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 20 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 6,101,499 to Ford (hereinafter "Ford").

Claim 7

Claim 7, as amended herein, recites a method that includes the features of "*manipulating the first address of each device by mathematically summing a predetermined number and the first address to derive the second address which is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number, the second address uniquely identifying each such device in the second network, the second address being different than the first address.*" It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there teaching of the quoted features above from claim 7 of mathematically summing a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address, the second address being the sum of the first address and the predetermined number, the second address being different than the first address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7, as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

Claims 10, 12

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 10 and 12 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 7, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 14

Claim 14, as amended herein, recites a method that includes the features of "*each second address is derived by mathematically summing a predetermined number to the corresponding first address of each device such that each second address is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number and that each second address is different than the corresponding first address.*" It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there teaching of the quoted features above from claim 14 of mathematically summing a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address, the second address being the sum of the first address and the predetermined number, the second address being different than the corresponding first address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14, as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

Claims 18, 20

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 18 and 20 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 14, which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

12-15. Claims 11 and 19 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Ford and the MOST Specification Framework Rev. 1.1 ["MOST spec"] (hereinafter "the MOST Specification").

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since their associated independent claims, claims 7 and 14 respectively, are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

16-19. Claims 13 and 21 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Ford, the MOST Specification and U.S. Patent 6,163,843 to Inoue (hereinafter "Inoue").

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot, since their associated independent claims, claims 7 and 14 respectively, are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

20-22. Claim 22 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the MOST Specification and Ford.

Claim 22 as amended herein, recites a method that includes the features of "*the second address is derived by mathematically summing a predetermined number to the corresponding first address such that each second address is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number and that each second address is different than the corresponding first address.*" It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in the MOST Specification or in Ford, or in any other cited prior art, is there teaching of the quoted features above from claim 22 of mathematically summing a predetermined number to the first address to derive the second address, the second address being the sum of the first address and the predetermined number, the second address being different than the corresponding first address. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 as amended herein, is allowable and should be passed to issuance.

23-26. Claims 23 and 25 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in the MOST Specification, Ford and Inoue.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 23 and 25 is moot, since these two claims each depend directly from claim 22 which is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 is hereby respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102